IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS

Applicant(s)	Kucharski	**REPLY BRIEF**
Serial No.	10/056,270	
Filing Date	1/24/2002	
Confirmation No.	8559	
Examiner Name	Tuan T. Dinh	
Group Art Unit	2841	
Attorney Docket No.	100.323US01	
Title: ELECTRICAL NOISE PROTECTION		

REMARKS

In the Examiner's Answer mailed September 24, 2007, the Examiner repeated the grounds of rejection from the Final Office Action. (*Examiner's Answer*, ¶ 9). The Examiner further addressed a number of comments in response to arguments in Appellant's Appeal Brief. Appellants provide the following arguments in response to the Examiner's Answer:

With respect to the Examiner's "**Response to arguments (a) and (b)**" set forth on page 7 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner asserts, without any evidence or explanation, that the alleged "conductive path" to which the Examiner refers is "disposed (embedded) within the circuit board (23)." As noted in Applicant's Appeal Brief, Akiba neither teaches nor suggests this. *See, e.g.,* Akiba, column 18, lines 43-48 ("The matching termination resistor Rc 25 (25-1, 25-2) is connected to the end of the parallel plate line (two lines for the rectangular shape) formed by the ground layer G1 15 and the ground layer G3 21 to absorb the potential fluctuation (resonance) of the power layer V1 16 and the power layer V2 20.") (emphasis added). In other words, Akiba does not teach or suggest that the ground layer G1 15 and the ground layer G3 21 "are electrically interconnected by a conductive trace disposed within the circuit board"; instead, those layers are interconnected using a resistor Rc connected to the end of the circuit board 23.

With respect to the Examiner's "**Response to arguments (c)**" set forth on pages 7-8 of the Examiner's Answer, it is noted that even if it was well known that the two circuit devices

(26, 28) are "capable of being operated at different levels" that does not teach or suggest the feature recited in claim 1 – that is, "wherein the second circuit operates at current levels substantially lower than the first circuit."

Therefore, Appellant respectfully asserts that the Examiner has failed to provide a proper evidentiary basis for the rejections of the appealed claims. Reversal of the final rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2007-11-15 /Jon M. Powers/

Jon M. Powers
Reg. No. 43,868

Attorneys for Appellant
Fogg & Powers LLC
P.O. Box 581339
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1339
T 612 332-4720
F 612 332-4731